Chester, CT 06412 (860) 526-9149 (860) 526-1043

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on February 7, 2005

C. G. Nessler





IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Serial No. 10,607,104

Date: February 6, 2004

Date Filed: 6/25/03

Examiner: S. Burhman

Applicant: Chung, Donna

Group: 3637

Title: Furniture having compound foldable parts Attorney No. 2245

RESPONSE AND AMENDMENT

Please amend the claims as shown in the attached status of claims.

Enclosed are seven sheets of replacement drawings. Please replace the existing drawings with the enclosed.

REMARKS

- 1. This is in response to the office action of October 6, 2004.
- 2. Applicant requests an extension of time in which to respond and encloses a check for \$55. Please charge any deficiency to deposit account 14-0711 in the name of undersigned attorney, with a reference number of 2245.
- 3. Applicant provides new drawings in response to examiner's requirement. The reason was not given, but applicant supposes it was because some of the lines were faint. Applicant submits that the enclosed enhanced drawings should be suitable in context of current standards and applicant ought be not required to use of a patent draftsperson. Applicant's attorney has submitted comparable drawings in various other cases.

If examiner finds the drawings still deficient and can make the non-conformity specific, applicant will address the problem. Applicant requests examiner call the attorney so he may promptly respond.

- 4. Applicant affirms the election of Group 1, namely claims 1-6 and 11-16, with traverse, in response to the restriction requirement. To the extent a restriction requirement might still be applied to the substantially amended claims, applicant admits that the species of withdrawn and elected claims are obvious variants.
- 5. Applicant has made numerous changes, to respond to the rejection under 35 USC 112. Applicant regrets the claims were difficult to understand. Applicant submits the claims are now improved, and more particular.